

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

New claims 35-37 have been added.

Claims 1-19, 22, 24 and 35-37 are pending in this application.

Claims 1 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 24 to cure the antecedent issue identified by the Examiner.

Regarding the § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Diwan. Applicants have amended the claims to recite subject matter neither disclosed nor suggested by Diwan.

In claim 1, Applicants claim “a plurality of rule objects operable to apply rules to said content object to prepare the content in a first way for communication over a first one of the different channels and publication by a certain terminal connected to that first channel and prepare the content in a second way for communication over a second one of the different channels and publication by a certain terminal connected to that second channel.” Diwan fails to teach this limitation. In Diwan, rules are applied to support bundle transmission based on Internet Protocol (IP) multicast routing techniques (see, col. 2, lines 41-52). Thus, while multiple networks are considered (col. 2, lines 59-65), Diwan publishes by preparing the content for communication in only a single way (i.e., the IP multicast way) with respect to all of those networks. There is no teaching for a first and second way preparation of the content for communication over corresponding different first and second communications channels.

It is further noted that Applicants claim that the rules used to prepare the content address not only the channel but also the connected terminal which will publish the communicated content. While Diwan recognizes the existence of multiple devices or terminals (see, col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 3), Diwan does nothing with its rule operations when preparing the content to address publishing differences between those devices/terminals. Rather, it appears that Diwan instead relies on operations performed by those devices/terminals after receipt of the multicast communication to handle device-specific publication issues. For example, Diwan teaches at col. 6, lines 20-25, that the subscriber devices receive the multicast information and then operate to discard extraneous information before display to the user. Diwan further gives an example in that the subscriber device itself functions to present the information, for example, as scrolling text or in a pop-up window. The formatting of the content for device publication (such as in scrolling or pop-up presentation) is instead controlled in the claimed invention through the rules applied to prepare the content prior to communication over the channel to the certain terminal/device.

Claims 17 and 24 are believed to distinguish over Diwan for at least the same reasons.

Applicants further claim in claim 1 “at least one container object operable to receive said content object and template the prepared content to meet a certain publishing environment specified by a publisher of the content.” There is no teaching or suggestion in Diwan for applying publisher environment templates against the prepared content prior to communication. As discussed in the Specification (page 9), this operation allows the content provider/publisher to control the look of the prepared content presentation at the device/terminal. Thus, if the content provider/publisher were a newspaper, the claimed container object would operate to ensure that the distributed content would be prepared so that when published at the device/terminal it would be presented in accordance with the provider/publisher’s environment

specification (for example, for a newspaper published it would look like a newspaper page or include the proper logos or possess the correct font or other details, which are associated with that provider/publisher).

Claims 18 and 35 are believed to distinguish over Diwan for at least the same reasons.

In dependent claims 19 and 36, Applicants claim that a first one of the distribution channels is a newspaper print publication channel and the second one of the distribution channels comprises an electronic publication channels such as email, broadcast, ethernet, wireless ethernet, cellular, video and the Internet. Diwan is focused wholly on electronic publication. There is no teaching or suggestion for having content be prepared in accordance with rules for publication relating to both newspaper printing and electronic publication.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are novel over Diwan. Applicants accordingly submit that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: 10/20/05

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andre M. Szuwalski

Registration No.: 35,701

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant